UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/827,392	04/19/2004	Jonah Staw	61145.129	3113
	7590 03/12/201 KWELL SANDERS L	EXAMINER		
190 Carondelet	Plaza	ZURITA, JAMES H		
Suite 600 ST. LOUIS, MO	O 63105		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3625	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/12/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

pto-sl@huschblackwell.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/827,392	STAW ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
JAMES ZURITA	3625		

	JAMES ZURITA	3625					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED <u>05 January 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appelor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request				
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07()	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth a ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	n.				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of chortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as				
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed was AMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	of the date of appeal. Since a				
3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further cortion (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE beloton) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a content of the proposed among the properties of the proposed among the properties of the pr	nsideration and/or search (see NOTw); ter form for appeal by materially rec	E below); ducing or simplifying th					
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proving the proposed amendment of the proposed	· owable if submitted in a separate, t ☑ will not be entered, or b) ☐ wil	imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the				
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1,3-6,8,9,11-13,15-18 and 24-43. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 21-23. AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 							
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fails	s to provide a				
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		•					
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but the request for reconsideration is not persuasive; the distance of the request for reconsideration is not persuasive; the distance of the request for reconsideration has been considered but the request for reconsideration is not persuasive; the distance of the request for reconsideration is not persuasive; the distance of the request for reconsideration is not persuasive; the distance of the request for reconsideration is not persuasive; the distance of the request for reconsideration is not persuasive; the distance of the request for reconsideration is not persuasive; the distance of the request for reconsideration is not persuasive; the distance of the request for reconsideration is not persuasive; the distance of the request for reconsideration is not persuasive; the reconsideration is not persuasive;	closures do not mention a compute						
 12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u>. 	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)						
	/James Zurita/ James Zu	ırita, Primary Exam	iner				

Application No. 10/827,392

Continuation of 13. Other: After further review, the indicated allowability of claims 1,3-6,8,9,11-13,15-18 and 24-43 is withdrawn because the claims are directed to non-statutory subject matter. The claims fail the machine-or-transformation test. Based on Supreme Court precedence see Diamond v Diehr 450 US 175,184 (1981); Parker v. Flook, 437 US 584,588,n. 9 (1978); Gottschalk v Benson, 409 US 63, 70 (1972); Cochtane v Deener, 94 US 780, 787-88 (1876) a 101 process must (1) be tied to another statutory class (such as an apparatus) or transform underlying subject mater (such as an article or materials) to a different state or thing. Since neither of these requirements is met by the claim the claim is rejected as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant's disclosures do not mention a computer. Further, mere placement of different design features on an item is not a non-trivial transformation.